

Remarks

Claims 1-36 and 38 are pending. New claims 39-47 are added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

Claim Amendments:

New claims 39-47 are added to further describe subject matter from the application as originally filed. Support for the claim amendments may be found at page 11, line 28 to page 12, line 15 and page 23, line 24 to page 25, line 16, among others.

No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments submitted herewith.

Telephonic Interview Summary

The examiner and primary examiner are thanked for their patient and attentive assistance during the interview of April 28, 2010.

During the interview, features of the present application and claim 1 in particular were discussed. Applicant's representative made specific reference to features of the screen component and data component mapping as set forth in the following portions of the application as filed:

page 11, line 28 to page 12, line 25;

page 19, line 30 to page 20, line 29; and

page 23, line 24 to page 24, line 20.

In particular, features of the use of the mapping that relate to code sharing and thus reduction of code/instructions to define the screen component or perform screen handling were discussed. As well, the dynamic nature of data component definitions was discussed such that, in some instances, data component definitions may be generated dynamically at runtime in response to a format of

data objects received in messages. Thus screen component definitions which map to dynamically generated data component definitions also achieve dynamic aspects.

The rejection of claim 1 for the reasons set forth in the recent office action were also examined, in particular, the alleged teachings of Carroll, Jr., were reviewed. Reference was made to various figures and associated description from Carroll, Jr. such as Figs 1-3, 7 and 12 to examine for any similar mapping features as is set forth in the claim 1 as currently presented. The program file of Fig. 12 and related description (e.g. [0213]-[0218]) of mapping for that file were also reviewed.

In brief, it was agreed that Carroll, Jr. does not disclose or suggest a mapping between a screen component and a data component as set forth in current claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 14, 18-29, 31, 36 and 38 as being unpatentable over Hulai et al. in view of Warila et al. and Carroll, Jr. (Applicant herein adopts the terminology of the cited references as used in the Office Action). The Examiner rejected claim 35 as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Carroll, Jr. The Examiner rejected claims 15-17, 32-34 as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Warila et al and Carroll, Jr. and further in view of Saulpaugh et al. The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 30 as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Warila et al and Carroll, Jr. and further in view of Greene et al.

For the reasons set forth in the telephonic summary above, applicant submits that all of the independent claims and their respective dependent claims are patentable over the cited references in the rejections. Common to each rejection is an allegation that Carroll, Jr. teaches the mapping feature as presently set forth in the independent claims. Agreement was reached during the interview

that Carroll, Jr. does not teach such a mapping. Withdrawal of the rejections is believed to be in order.

New Claims

Dependent claims to each of the independent claims or claims dependent therefrom are added to particularly reference a code reduction feature and/or a dynamic data component definition feature set forth in the application as filed. Applicant submits that the subject matter currently presented in new claims 39-47 is also patentable.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons set out above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application in its presently amended form is in condition for allowance and action toward that goal is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Henry Ohab/

Henry Ohab
Registration No. 45,854
416 862 3593

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario
M5X 1G5

TOR_LAW\ 7368676\1